REMARKS

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by Wilson (US Patent 7,007,080) ("Wilson"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited reference fails to anticipate Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 1-25.

Wilson teaches a server and method that allows a computer configured for a different network to access a network without hardware or software configuration changes to the computer. (Wilson abstract)

With respect to independent claim 1 in the presently claimed invention, Applicant teaches and claims:

> "A method, comprising connecting a device to a network, *logic*
>
> *within the device* determining a unique identifier based on the network,
>
> *logic within the device* obtaining network configuration settings that
>
> are associated with the unique network identifier, *logic within the*
>
> *device* intercepting network traffic originating from an application
>
> located on the device, and *logic within the device* rerouting the
>
> intercepted network traffic to a final correct location using the
>
> obtained network configuration settings." (Claim 1) (Emphasis added)

Applicant asserts that Wilson does not anticipate Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claim 1 because Wilson does not teach at least the logic to perform the method being contained within the device that is being connected to the network.

The system and method within Wilson are limited specifically to a remote server performing many of the steps associated with connecting a device to a network. Specifically, Wilson states:

> "SolutionIP™ is a <u>server-based solution</u> designed to allow users to connect to a computer with a working Ethernet Network Interface Card (NIC) and an IP-based network configuration to the Internet. <u>The guests physically connect to the SolutionIP™ system via a network interface connection</u>. Most users will have seamless connectivity, however <u>there are limitations...</u>" (Wilson, column 3, lines 36-42) (Emphasis added)

Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claim 1 fundamentally differs with Wilson in the key aspect where Applicant's method is contained within the device connecting to the Internet. Applicant's method is a purely local solution and does not require any form of connection to a service based on a remote server. There are inherent limitations (as Wilson even points out) to a method that requires the device connecting to the Internet to be required to communicate with a remote server before any possible method is performed. A purely local solution that is self-contained within the connecting device is superior in many situations and altogether different than the system and method claimed in Wilson. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Wilson does not anticipate Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claim 1.

In regard to independent claims 11 and 16, Applicant respectfully submits that Wilson does not anticipate Applicant's invention at least for the same reasons as independent claim 1. Again, Wilson does not teach at least machine readable medium or

the system to perform the method <u>being contained within the device that is being</u>

<u>connected to the network</u>. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Wilson does not

anticipate independent claims 11 and 16 of the presently claimed invention.

Claims 2-10, 12-15, and 17-25 depend from and further limit independent claims

1, 11, and 16, respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons advanced above with

respect to independent claims 1, 11, and 16, Applicant respectfully submits that Wilson

does not anticipate claims 2-10, 12-15, and 17-25.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

rejection of claims 1-25.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 50-0221. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Derek J. Reynolds at (916) 356-5374.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: September 25, 2007   /Derek J. Reynolds/
                             Derek J. Reynolds
                             Reg. No.: 60,104

Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(916)356-5358